



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,181	11/03/2000	Theron Tock	DANAP001	5562
22434	7590	08/16/2004	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			LAZARO, DAVID R	
P.O. BOX 778				
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,181

Applicant(s)

TOCK ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed 05/27/2004.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 15, 16 and 18 were amended.
3. Claims 21-27 were added. Claim 20 was canceled.
4. Claims 1-19 and 21-27 are pending in this Office Action.
5. Request for Withdrawal of Attorney or Agent received 07/09/2004.
6. The 36 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection of Claim 13 is withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
8. Claim 1-5, 11-14, 18-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Intermediaries: new places for producing and manipulating Web content" by Barrett and Magilo (Barrett). Note: This prior art was provided by applicant through an IDS.
9. With respect to Claim 1, Barrett teaches an information retrieval system that serves to retrieve information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network, the client machine operating a network browser (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said system comprising: an intermediate server coupled to a network (Page 514-515; Section 4.1 "Configurations"), said intermediate server receives requests destined for a remote server (Page 511 Fig. 2) and performs processing on responses to the requests from the remote server before returning the responses to a client machine (Page 512, Sections

Art Unit: 2155

3.1 and 3.2): and at least one third-party application plug-in installed on the intermediate server (Page 512 Section 3 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of Section 3.2 "WBI operation"), the third-party application plug-in to filter the response to render at least one feature available at the client machine without counterpart plug-ins at the client machine (Page 510, "Web Personalization" and "Content Distillation" paragraphs, and Pages 512-513 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", and Table 1 on page 513).

10. With respect to Claim 2, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said third-party application plug-in operates at said intermediate server to process the responses to the requests from the remote server before returning the responses to the client machine (Page 512, Sections 3.1 and 3.2).

11. With respect to Claim 3, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said third-party application plug-in operates at said intermediate server to pass the responses to the requests from the remote server through a application filter provided by said third-party application plug-in before returning the responses to the client machine (Page 512, Section 3).

12. With respect to Claim 4, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said information retrieval system further comprises: an application plug in framework that facilitates incorporating at least one third-party application plug-in within the intermediate server (Page 512 Section 3, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of section 3.2 "WBI operation"); a data storage device operatively connected or within said intermediate server (Page 513 Fig. 4); and a cookie manager operable on said intermediate server

Art Unit: 2155

(Page 513, Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager"), said cookie manager operates to manage centralized storage of cookies in said data storage device with respect to the client machine and the remote server (Page 513 Fig. 4), wherein cookies from the remote server provided with a response are stored in said data storage device by said cookie manager instead of at the client machine (Page 513 Fig. 4), and wherein said cookie manager retrieves previously stored cookies from said data storage device that are associated with the remote server and the client machine (Page 513 Fig. 4), and provides the retrieved previously stored cookies to the remote server with the request (Page 513 Fig. 4).

13. With respect Claim 5, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said information retrieval system further comprises: a data storage device operatively connected or within said intermediate server (Page 510 "Document caching" paragraph); and a history manager operable on said intermediate server, said history manager operates to manage centralized storage of previously requested resources in said data storage device with respect to the client machine (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

14. With respect to Claim 11, Barrett teaches a method for processing resource requests received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said method comprising: (a) receiving, at the intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor, the resource request requesting a particular resource (Page 511, Fig. 2); (b) determining a hostname for a remote server hosting the particular resource being requested (Page 512

Art Unit: 2155

Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); (c) sending a request for the particular resource to the remote server based on the determined hostname (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 1 and 2); (d) receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request from the remote server (Pages 512-512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation"); processing the response through a third-party application plug-in, the processing including filtering the response to render at least one feature available at the request without counterpart plug-ins at the requestor (Page 510, "Web Personalization" and "Content Distillation" paragraphs, and Pages 512-513 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", and Table 1 on page 513); and sending a modified response to the requestor (Pages 512-512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation").

15. With respect to Claim 12, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches said method further comprises the acts of: (g) centrally saving the modified response such that the modified response is able to be subsequently recalled by the requestor (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

16. With respect to Claim 13, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches said saving (g) saves the modified response in the central storage (Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

17. With respect to Claim 14, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches the resource request is a HTTP (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) request including at least a URL having an initial hostname for the

Art Unit: 2155

particular resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

18. With respect to Claim 18, Barrett teaches a computer readable medium including at least computer program code for processing resource requests received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said computer readable medium comprising: computer code for receiving, at an intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor, the resource request requesting a particular resource (Page 511, Fig. 2); computer code for determining a hostname for a remote server hosting the particular resource being requested (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); computer code for sending a request for the particular resource to the remote server based on the determined hostname (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 1 and 2); computer code for receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request from the remote server; computer program code for modifying the response including processing the response through at least one third-party application plug-in to filter the response to render at least one feature available at the client machine without counterpart plug-ins at the client machine (Page 510, "Web Personalization" and "Content Distillation" paragraphs, and Pages 512-513 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", and Table 1 on page 513) and sending a modified response to the requestor (Page 512-513 Section 3.2 "WBI operation").

19. With respect to Claim 19, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches said computer readable medium further comprises: computer

Art Unit: 2155

program code for centrally saving the modified response such that the modified response is able to be subsequently recalled by the requestor (Page 509, abstract, Page 510, "Web personalization" and "Document caching" paragraphs and Page 515, 1st Paragraph).

20. With respect to Claim 20, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches the response from the remote server comprises HTML data (Page 513, Table 1, "Document Editor").

21. With respect to Claim 21, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches a third party application plug-in of the at least one third-party application plug-in is operable to remove data from the response (Page 513-514, Section 3.3.1)

22. With respect to Claim 22, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the intermediate server receives request from a plurality of client networks (Page 510, Introduction, and Page 512-513, Section 3.2).

23. With respect to Claim 23, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the intermediate server returns responses a plurality of client networks (Page 510, Introduction, and Page 512-513, Section 3.2).

24. With respect to Claim 24, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the application plug-in framework includes a plurality of third-party application plug-ins operable to filter the response in series (Page 512-513, Section 3.2, and Page 514, Section 3.3.2, and Fig. 5).

25. With respect to Claim 27, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches wherein the response is processed in series through a



Art Unit: 2155

plurality of third-party application plug-ins (Page 512-513, Section 3.2, and Page 514, Section 3.3.2, and Fig. 5).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

26. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

27. Claims 6-10, 15-17, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of U.S. Patent 5,752,022 by Chiu et al. (Chiu). Chiu was also provided through applicant's IDS.

28. With respect to Claim 6, Barrett teaches an intermediary server system (Page 514-515, Section 4.1 Configurations), comprising: a web server that receives requests for resources from client machines (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), a HTTP handler operatively connected to said web server, said HTTP handler receives the requests for resources, modifies the requests (Page 513 Table 1 "Request Editor") to be directed to appropriate remote servers via the network, and forwards the modified requests for resources to the appropriate remote servers (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph); a HTML parser operatively connected to said HTTP handler, said HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the appropriate remote servers in response to the modified requests (Page 513 Table 1 "Document Editor"); and a session manager that manages a communication session between each client machine or their users and the intermediary server system (Page 513-514, Section 3.3.1, and Fig. 4 , Page 515, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph, Page 510 "Web personalization" paragraph). Barrett

Art Unit: 2155

does not explicitly disclose modifying the resources such that certain links are modified to be directed to the intermediary server system. However, one can modify received resources such that certain links contained therein can be modified to be directed to the intermediary server system as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that said HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the appropriate remote servers in response to the modified requests, and modifies the resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to an intermediary server system instead of remote servers. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system that can provide additional linking information or functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

29. With respect to Claim 7, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: (Page 515, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph); a server information manager that manages remote server supplied identification or state information provided to said intermediary server system by remote servers (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 Cookie Manager); and a data store for storage of session management data provided by said session manager and remote server supplied identification or state information provided by said server information manager (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 Cookie Manager).

Art Unit: 2155

30. With respect to Claim 8, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches the remote server supplied identification or the state information provided by said server information manager comprises cookies (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager").

31. With respect to Claim 9, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: a history manager operable to manage storage and retrieval of resources previously requested by a particular client machine or their users, wherein the history manager uniquely stores each resource identified by one or more of a URL, a host name, a path, a timestamp, and a file reference (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Web personalization" and Page 515, 1st Paragraph).

32. With respect to Claim 10, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: an application plug-in framework that facilitates incorporating at least one application plug-in within said intermediary server system so as to provide additional functionality (Page 512 Section 3, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of section 3.2 "WBI operation").

33. With respect to Claim 15, Barrett teaches A method for processing a resource requested received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said method comprising the acts of: (a) receiving, at an intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor (Page 511, Fig. 2); (b) determining an address for a remote server hosting the

Art Unit: 2155

requested resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); (c) retrieving at least one cookie associated with the remote server from a central storage associated with the intermediary server (Page 513, Fig. 4 and Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager"); (d) sending a request for the requested resource with the retrieved cookie to the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4); (e) receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request from the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4 ); (f) storing any cookies provided with the received response in the central storage such that the cookies are associated with the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4); sending the modified response to the requestor (Page 512-513 Section 3.2 "WBI operation"); and managing a communication session between the requestors and the intermediary server system (Page 513-514, Section 3.3.1, and Fig. 4 , Page 515, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph, Page 510 "Web personalization" paragraph). Barrett does not explicitly disclose modifying the response so that links in the response will point to the intermediate server.

However, one can modify responses such that links within them can be modified to point to the intermediary server as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that the method further comprises the acts of (e) modifying the response so that links within the response point to the intermediate server; and (f) sending the modified response to the requestor. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system that can provide additional linking information or

Art Unit: 2155

functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

34. With respect to Claim 16, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 15 and further teaches said method further comprises the acts of:(j) saving the modified response to the central storage such that the modified response is associated with the requestor (Page 509, abstract, Page 510, "Web personalization" and "Document caching" paragraphs, and Page 515, 1st Paragraph).

35. With respect to Claim 17, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 15 and further teaches the resource request is a HTTP (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) request including at least a URL having an initial hostname for the particular resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

36. With respect to Claim 25, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches wherein the web server receives request from client machines located on a plurality of client networks (Page 510, Introduction, and Page 512-513, Section 3.2).

37. With respect to Claim 26, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches wherein the modified resources are returned to client machines located on a plurality of client networks (Page 510, Introduction, and Page 512-513, Section 3.2).

***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicants' arguments filed 05/27/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

39. Applicants argue - *"Barrett does not disclose or suggest at least one third-party plug-in to filter a response as claimed...the plug-ins described by Barrett are different from the claimed application plug-ins. The plug-ins are not application plug-ins which filter a response to render at least one feature available at the client machine which would otherwise require a corresponding plug-in on the client."*

a. Applicants do not provide sufficient evidence as to why the plug-ins described by Barrett are different from the claimed application plug-ins.

Applicants state a deficiency in function, however, the plug-ins described in Barrett, have at their base functionality, the ability to filter a response.

This is apparent in the "Document Editor" (Pages 512-513, Section 3.2 and Table 1), which is a basic building block of a plug-in in Barrett. Some of the example features provided by the "Document Editor" are "Add annotations, highlight links, add toolbars, translate document format (e.g. from Rich to Text Format to HTML), change form information, add scripts".

Other ideas for features to be rendered by the intermediary system can be seen in the "Web personalization" and "Content distillation" paragraphs on page 510. All of these may be provided by the intermediary system without a corresponding plug-in on the client. This is seen in the proxy

and server-side configuration described in the 1<sup>st</sup> two paragraphs on Page 515. Also see Page 515, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, where Barrett states the use of the "cookie manager" plug-in "illustrates some of the advantages of building functions with intermediaries rather than building functions directly into browsers." As such, the plug-ins of Barrett filter a response to render at least one feature available at the client machine which would otherwise require a corresponding plug-in on the client. Furthermore, the basic definition of a plug-in is "A hardware or software module that adds a specific feature or service to a larger system. The idea is that the new component simply *plugs in* to the existing system." (From the Webopedia definition of "plug-in"). The plug-ins of Barrett are software modules (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 4 on Page 514), that add specific features or services (such as those stated above and the example plug-ins of sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 on pages 513-514) to a larger system (Web transactions such as those between a client and a server on the Internet, see Introduction section). The plug-ins of Barrett "define the basic unit of granularity for installation, configuration, and enable/disable." (Page 513, last paragraph of section 3.2). In other words, a plug-in or multiple plug-ins define the intermediary system and can be easily incorporated into (plugged in to) the system since they are all defined by the same basic building blocks (Page 512-513, Sections 3.1-3.2). In fact, one of the goals of the design of WBI is for "easy development and deployment of

intermediary applications" (Page 512, Section 3). For all these reasons, Barrett discloses an application plug-in as stated in the claims.

40. Applicants argue - *"Barrett does not disclose or suggest a session manager as claimed that manages communications between clients and an intermediary server. The session manager provides information on the current state of a communication session between a client and the intermediary server, which is different from Barrett's proxy configuration that separates different workgroup users and does not provide state information."*

b. Claim 6 states "a session manager that manages a communication session between each client machine or their users and the intermediary server system." There are no explicit limitations defining provision of information on the current state of the session (state information). The claim limitations simply state a management of a communication session. In the "Cookie manager" plug-in described by Barrett (Page 513-514, Section 3.3.1 and Fig. 4), cookies are added and removed during a communication session based on stored policy. As such, the "Cookie manager" could be considered a session manager. The description of the proxy configuration (Page 515, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) can also be considered to contain a session manager since there is user authentication (which would include state information for a user in a communication session), individual histories (where a particular user has been in a communication session), and custom configurations (how a particular communication session



should execute). The idea of a custom communication session is further described in the "Web personalization" paragraph on page 510. There is obviously management of a communication session between a client and an intermediary if the intermediary can "formulate a model of the user and then alter what the user sees to personalize the browsing experiences."

All of these examples can be considered management of a communication session "between each client machine or their users and the intermediary server system."

41. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest a history manager that uniquely stores each resource as claimed...the abstract does not disclose or suggest the claimed history manager that uniquely stores each resource...Barrett only discloses a generic cache and does not disclose the claimed history manager that uniquely stores resources. Further Barrett does not disclose or suggest the claimed information stored by the history manager includes a URL, hostname, timestamp, and file reference."*

c. Barrett teaches the use of a history manager. The abstract on page 509 mentions the use of the WBI intermediary system to construct applications such as personal histories. The "Web personalization" paragraph (Page 510) also describes changing one's web experience based on a "user's history of browsing". On page 515, the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph states that the intermediary system can "maintain individual histories". A personal history would at least contain a URL identifying where the user

has been. Further evidence of the idea of a "personal history" as intended by Barrett can be seen in a related article "How to Personalize the Web" by Barrett and incorporated by Barrett on Page 510, "Web personalization" paragraph, item [1]. In this article, a personal history is described as the "sequence of URLs visited by the user along with the text of each URL" (See page 79, 'Personal History' paragraph in "How to Personalize the Web"). Based on these reasons, Barrett's intermediary system can include a history manager that uniquely stores each resource which includes a URL.

42. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest the claimed application plug-in framework that facilitates incorporating at least one application plug-in within the intermediary server system to provide additional functionality."*

d. As noted earlier, the architecture of Barrett is formed by basic building blocks that can be called plug-ins when grouped together to perform a function for the intermediary system (Page 512 Section 3, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of section 3.2 "WBI operation"). The examiner interprets this to be an application plug-in framework that facilitates incorporating at least one application plug-in within the intermediary server system to provide additional functionality. The additional functionality may include filtering and modifying documents

Art Unit: 2155

retrieved documents as well as general management of communication sessions as noted above.

43. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest processing the response through a third-party application plug-in as claimed."*

e. Barrett clearly describes processing of a response through a plug-in as noted in the first argument and described by Barrett in Section 3.2 'WBI operation'.

44. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest the removal of data from a response at an intermediate server as claimed."*

f. The plug-ins of Barrett provide the basic ability to modify the response at the intermediate server as described in Section 3.2 'WBI operation' and in Table 1 (Pages 512-513). Furthermore, the example plug-in of a 'Cookie manager', removes cookies from the response (Page 513, Section 3.3.1). Thus Barrett discloses the removal of data from a response at an intermediate server.

45. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest an intermediate server that receives requests from a plurality of client networks as claimed...that returns responses to a plurality of client networks"*

g. The general environment of Barrett is the Internet, and the general purpose of the intermediary system of Barrett is to improve the Web

experience (See the Introduction section). The Internet includes a plurality of client networks. As such, the intermediary system of Barrett is intended to be used in such an environment where the system will receive requests from a plurality of client networks and return responses to a plurality of client networks. The general operation of handling requests and returning responses is described in Section 3.2 (Pages 512-513).

46. Applicants argue - *"Neither Barrett nor Chiu disclose or suggest more than one third-party application plug-in arranged in series to filter responses as claimed...Barrett does not disclose or suggest a system that includes more than one plug-in. Furthermore, Barrett does not disclose or suggest an arrangement of third party plug-ins such that the plug-ins process responses in series as claimed."*

h. Barrett describes a plug-in as "the basic unit of granularity for installation." The basic idea is that an intermediary system can be made up of one or more plug-ins depending on what is needed and how complex the intermediary application is to be. This can be seen on Page 514, section 3.3.2 with the example of Improving wireless performance. The section describes "a more complex set of WBI Plugins" (emphasis added) to make a wireless Internet connection more efficient. The description under Fig. 5 states "Several WBI plugins that work together to improve a wireless Web browser" (emphasis added). Under section 4.2 (Page 515), an embodiment using Java Beans is disclosed. This section

Art Unit: 2155

states, "When WBI starts up, each registered Plugin is initialized."

(emphasis added). Thus, Barrett clearly discloses more than one plug-in.

Furthermore, plug-ins process responses in series based on the priorities that are defined by the plug-ins themselves (Pages 512-513, section 3.2).

### **Conclusion**

47. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Lazaro  
August 9, 2004



HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER